

REMARKS

Claims 1-95 were pending in this application. In the Office Action, claims 1-95 were rejected.

Claims 2, 4-11, 14, 16, 23, 24, 26-31, 33-39, 43-58, 60, 61, 64-70, and 72-95 are hereby canceled without prejudice or disclaimer. Claims 1, 3, 12, 13, 15, 17-22, 25, 32, 40-42, 59, 62, 63, and 71 are hereby amended to more specifically recite inherent aspects of the invention as originally claimed. New claims 96-98 are hereby added.

Reconsideration of this application as amended, and allowance of all pending claims 1, 3, 12, 13, 15, 17-22, 25, 32, 40-42, 59, 62, 63, and 71, as amended, are hereby respectfully requested.

Double Patenting

On page 3 of the Office Action, claims 1, 43, 59 and 76 were provisionally rejected under judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting over claims 1, 21 and 34 of copending U.S. Patent Application Serial No. 10/800,473 in view of U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2004/0052218 (“Knappe”). Claims 43 and 76 were cancelled herein, and thus, this rejection is now moot for claims 43 and 76.

Applicant submit that claims 1 and 59, as amended, are distinguishable from the claims of U.S. Patent Application Serial No. 10/800,473 in view of Knappe. However, if the Examiner maintains this provisional rejection, Applicant will consider filing a terminal disclaimer for this application upon converting of the provisional double patenting rejection into a double patenting rejection after issuance of copending U.S. Patent application No. 10/800,473 and upon indication of allowable claims in this patent application.

Rejections under 35 USC §112, Second Paragraph

On page 3 of the Office Action, claim 76 was rejected under 35 USC §112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. Claim 76 is canceled herein, and thus this rejection is now moot.

Rejection under 35 USC §102(e)

On page 4 of the Office Action, claims 1-3, 9-15, 28-30, 33-35, 43-54, 57, 76-78, 81 and 84-86 were rejected under 35 USC §102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2004/0052218 (“Knappé”). Claims 2, 9-11, 14, 28-30, 33-35, 43-54, 57, 76-78, 81, and 84-86 are canceled herein; and thus, rejection of these claims is now moot. Rejection of claims 1, 3, 12, 13 and 15 are traversed in view of the amendment.

Independent claim 1, as amended, specifically recites:

A call processing platform for providing call processing services to multiple prison facilities, comprising:

a networking device connected via digital data links to call processing gateways at the multiple prison facilities, at least one of the multiple prison facilities located remotely from the call processing platform, each of the multiple prison facilities including multiple telephone terminals, the networking device receiving or sending data packets converted from or into call signals at the call processing gateways;

an unauthorized call activity detection system connected to the networking device for detecting unauthorized call activity associated with calls placed using one or more of the multiple telephone terminals; and a call application management system connected to the networking device and the unauthorized call activity detection system for processing and transmitting the calls from the multiple telephone terminals to a first telephone carrier network.

The call processing platform of claim 1 includes a networking device, an unauthorized call activity detection system and a call application management system. The

networking device is connected to call processing gateways at multiple prison facilities at least one of which is located remotely from the call processing platform. As a result, the call processing platform is located remote from at least one prison facility. The unauthorized call activity detection system connects with the network device to detect unauthorized call activity in the calls placed at the prison facilities. A call application management system processes calls to and from the prison facilities for communication over the first telephone carrier network.

The feature of “*call processing platform . . . comprising: a networking device connected via digital data links to call processing gateways at the multiple prison facilities, at least one of the multiple prison facilities located remotely from the call processing platform, each of the multiple prison facilities including multiple telephone terminals*” recited in claim 1, as amended, is advantageous. That is, since the call processing platform is located remotely from at least one of the multiple prison facilities, and the call application management system and the unauthorized call activity detection system are centralized in such call processing platform, (i) the multiple prison facilities can take advantage of a full featured call processing system without incurring the full expense associated with such system (see, for example, specification, paragraphs [0051] and [0055]), (ii) updating and expansion of the call processing system may be facilitated by centralizing updates and expansion (see, for example, specification, paragraph [0051]), and (iii) the use of communication lines may be optimized by obviating the need for individual prison facilities to purchase separate telephone lines (see, for example, specification, paragraphs [0059] and [0060]).

The feature of “*an unauthorized call activity detection system connected to the networking device for detecting unauthorized call activity associated with calls placed using one or more of the multiple telephone terminals*” as recited in claim 1, as amended, is also advantageous because unauthorized call activities such as three-way calls may be prevented. See, for example, specification, paragraph [0036].

Knappe fails to disclose any of these two features. First, Knappe does not disclose the feature of “*call processing platform . . . comprising: a networking device connected via digital data links to call processing gateways at the multiple prison facilities, at least one of the multiple prison facilities located remotely from the call processing platform, each of the multiple prison facilities including multiple telephone terminals*” as recited in claim 1, as amended. Knappe at best discloses a plurality of communications devices 16 communicating over a network 14 with a gateway 20 that converts IP packets to call signals and vice versa. See Knappe, paragraph [0027]. In Knappe, the network 14 includes a call manager 30 and a conference bridge 32 that may process the calls from the communications devices 16. The call manager 30 and the conference bridge 32 may be located in a central facility or have their functionality distributed across the network 14. See Knappe, paragraph [0028]. Knappe, however, fails to disclose that (i) the communication devices 16 are located in *prison facilities* and that (ii) the communication devices 16 are located *remotely* from the call manager 30 or the conference bridge 32. Therefore, Knappe fails to disclose the feature of “*call processing platform . . . comprising: a networking device connected via digital data links to call processing gateways at the multiple prison facilities, at least one of the multiple prison facilities located remotely from the call processing platform, each of the multiple prison facilities including multiple telephone terminals*” as recited in claim 1,

as amended.

Secondly, Knappe fails to disclose the feature of “*an unauthorized call activity detection system connected to the networking device for detecting unauthorized call activity associated with calls placed using one or more of the multiple telephone terminals*” as recited in claim 1, as amended. The disclosure of Knappe is mostly concerned with improving the intelligibility of moderator during a communication session. See Knappe, paragraph [0006]. Accordingly, the architecture of the communication system is described briefly in Knappe as background information. Nowhere in Knappe does it disclose anything about detecting unauthorized call activity. Therefore, Knappe fails to disclose the feature of “*an unauthorized call activity detection system connected to the networking device for detecting unauthorized call activity associated with calls placed using one or more of the multiple telephone terminals*” as recited in claim 1, as amended.

Therefore, claim 1, as amended, is patentably distinguishable from Knappe because Knappe fails to disclose at least the above two features.

Claims 3, 12, 13 and 15 depend from claim 1. Therefore, the same arguments set forth above for claim 1 are equally applicable to claims 3, 12, 13 and 15.

Furthermore, claim 15 is patentable for the additional reason that it recites “call application management system communicates with said telephone carrier network using digital data packets.” Knappe discloses coupling analog telephones 18 and the gateway 20 with a public switched telephone network (PSTN) that uses standard analog telephone signals. See Knappe, paragraph [0027]. Knappe does not disclose that digital communications may be used in the PSTN. Therefore, Knappe fails to disclose that the digital packets are used for communicating with the telephone carrier network.

Accordingly, claim 15 is patentable for the additional reason that it recites “using digital data packets” to communicate with the telephone carrier network.

In summary, claims 1, 3, 12, 13 and 15, as amended, are patentably distinguishable from Knappe based at least on the reasons set forth above. Therefore, the Examiner is respectfully requested to withdraw this rejection for claims 1, 3, 12, 13 and 15.

Rejection under 35 USC §103(a)

On page 11 of the Office Action, claims 4-8, 16-27, 31, 32, 36-42, 55, 56, 58-75, 79, 80, 82, 83 and 87-95 were rejected under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over Knappe in view of U.S. Patent No. 7,333,798 (“Hodge”). Claims 4-8, 16, 23, 24, 26, 27, 31, 36-39, 55, 56, 58, 60, 61, 64-70, 72-75, 79, 80, 82, 83, and 87-95 are cancelled herein; and thus, rejection of these claims are moot. Rejection of claims 17-22, 25, 32, 40-42, 59, 62, 63, and 71 is hereby traversed in view of the amendment.

Independent claim 1, as amended, recites the feature of “*call processing platform . . . comprising: a networking device connected via digital data links to call processing gateways at the multiple prison facilities, at least one of the multiple prison facilities located remotely from the call processing platform, each of the multiple prison facilities including multiple telephone terminals.*” As set forth above, Knappe fails to disclose this feature. Neither does Hodge disclose this feature. Hodge discloses a call management system 101 including multiple telephones 102 located in an institutional facility. See Hodge, col. 18, ll. 19-30. The call management system 101 is connected to an outgoing trunk line 111 that consists of multiple connections to telephone service providers. See Hodge, col. 18, ll. 51-55. The call management system 101 of Hodge, however, serves and processes calls

from only one institutional facility. Nowhere in Hodge does it state that the call management system 101 is connected to call processing gateways at *multiple* prison facilities. Therefore, both Knappe and Hodge fail to disclose the feature of “*call processing platform . . . comprising: a networking device connected via digital data links to call processing gateways at the multiple prison facilities, at least one of the multiple prison facilities located remotely from the call processing platform, each of the multiple prison facilities including multiple telephone terminals*” as recited in claim 1 as amended.

Claims 17-22, 25, 27, 32 and 40-42 depend from claim 1. Therefore, essentially the same arguments set forth above for claim 1 are equally applicable to claims 17-22, 25, 27, 32, and 40-42. Therefore, claims 17-22, 25, 27, 32 and 40-42 are also patentably distinct from Knappe and Hodge.

Independent claim 59, as amended, also recites “*connecting with call processing gateways at the multiple prison facilities via digital data links, at least one of the multiple prison facilities located remotely from the call processing platform, each of the multiple prison facilities including multiple telephone terminals . . .*” Therefore, essentially the same arguments set forth above for claim 1 are equally applicable to claim 59 and its dependent claims 62, 63, and 71.

In summary, claims 17-22, 25, 32, 40-42, 59, 62, 63, and 71, as amended, are patentably distinguishable from Knappe and Hodge. Therefore, the Examiner is respectfully requested to withdraw rejection of claims 17-22, 25, 32, 40-42, 59, 62, 63, and 71 in view of the amendment.

Conclusion

It is submitted that all pending claims 1, 3, 12, 13, 15, 17-22, 25, 32, 40-42, 59, 62, 63, 71, and 96-98, as amended, are in condition for allowance. Favorable action is solicited.

Respectfully Submitted,
Robert Rac

Date: August 19, 2008

By: /Dohyun Ahn/
Dohyun Ahn, Ltd. Rec. No. L0359
FENWICK & WEST LLP
801 California Street
Mountain View, CA 94041
Phone: (650) 335-7291
Fax: (650) 938-5200